



Argu.

PATENT APPLICATION

Coper
4-3-03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Hironari IWASAKI et al.

Group Art Unit: 3661

Application No.: 09/632,793

Examiner: B. Broadhead

Filed: August 4, 2000

Docket No.: 106766

For: A NAVIGATION SYSTEM AND A MEMORY MEDIUM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

RECEIVED
MAR 31 2003
GROUP 3600

In reply to the October 22, 2002 Office Action, the period for reply effectively extended by a two-month Petition for Extension of Time to March 24, 2003, reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 16 and 17 are pending.

Claims 3, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As alleged by the Examiner, line 7 of claims 3, 16 and 17 fail to provide sufficient antecedent basis for "said register points". However, Applicants assert that they have provided sufficient antecedent basis in line 2 of claims 3, 16 and 17 in first introducing "register points". It is the introduction of this feature in line 2 of the claims that provides proper antecedent basis for "said register points" in line 7 of claims 3, 16 and 17. It is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite as to the flags. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed in claim 3, lines 3-7, for example, Applicants recite "an information storage means for storing ... flags representing the presence or absence of said registered point data". Applicants further recite in claims 3, lines 9 and 10, "said flags representing the presence or absence of said registered point data in said information storage means". As such, Applicants assert that they have clearly and consistently recited that the flags, stored in the information storage means, represent the presence or absence of the registered point data. It is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Mikame, U. S. Patent No. 6,144,920. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Mikame fails to disclose a navigation system having an input means for inputting information or a reference position for searching register points, an information storage means for storing register point data, a search means for searching the register points within a predetermined limit, area or block, and a display means for displaying the results of the search as recited in the various independent claims 1, 3, 16 and 17, respectively.

As stated in paragraph 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that claim 1 fails to recite an input means for inputting a reference area. Applicant respectfully traverse this assertion. On the last two lines of claim 1, Applicants recite that the input means can input an area. As such, Applicants assert that Mikame, for the reasons discussed in the June 26, 2002 filed Amendment, only inputs the reference position and not the area surrounding the reference position, such as a country, state or city. Thus, Mikame fails to teach, suggest or disclose the combination of features claimed with respect to claim 1, from which claim 2 depends.

As also stated in paragraph 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the flags in claims 3, 16 and 17 are unclear. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion. For the reasons discussed above in reply to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants assert that the flags and what they represent are clearly recited in the claims.

Also with claims 3, 16 and 17, Applicants assert that Mikame fails to disclose a navigation system with a display means for displaying each category with flags representing the presence of the register points searched by the searching means.

On the other hand, Mikame displays all categories, as shown in Fig. 6A, but does not display only a category or area with flags representing the presence of registered point data as in the claimed invention. Applicants further clarify that two flags are used. The first flag represents the presence or absence of the registered point data and flags representing the presence of the registered point searched by the search means. Applicants assert that the flags are clearly recited in discussing what they represent. As discussed in the June 26, 2002 filed Amendment, even if airports do not exist around the reference position, for example, Mikame nevertheless always displays the category "airport" shown in Fig. 6A. Thus, even if a user selects "airport" in Mikame, the search result is "no airport exists around the reference position". According to claim 3, for example, of Applicants' invention, however, the same case would result in a category "airport" being given a flag indicating the absence of an airport and the display means would not display "airport", as described in the specification at page 13, line 29 to page 14, line 10, for example.

Thus, as discussed above, Mikame fails to teach, disclose or suggest the display means for displaying each category with flags representing the presence of the register points searched by the searching means as recited in claims 3, 16 and 17. It is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mikame in view of Maekawa et al. (Maekawa), U. S. Patent No. 6,038,508. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants asserts that Maekawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Mikame as applied to claim 1. In addition, claim 2 recites additional features of the invention and is also believed to be allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. It is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 16 and 17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/sxb

Date: March 24, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--